

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-53 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 32, and 36 are currently amended, and such amendments are fully supported by the specification and drawings at least at page 17, line 16-page 18, line 2, and Figure 6. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Rejection 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-22, 24-44, 45-47 and 49-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Simonoff et al. U.S. 6,078,322. As set forth in more detail below, the reference fails to describe every element of every claim as required by MPEP § 2131, and therefore the rejection is unsupported by the art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1, 32, and 36 recite “supplementing a skeletal UI...with one or more icons, labels or menu items, or combinations thereof.” The *Simonoff* reference fails to disclose this limitation. *Simonoff* describes a Universal Client device that is downloaded to the client host 300, which in turn loads and interprets a GUIScript file, and then displays an appropriate GUI to the user. Col. 8, line 66-Col. 9, line 4; Col. 9, lines 34-38. However, there is no indication in the reference that the GUIScript file or the GUI is anything less than an entire UI displayed to a user. Nowhere does *Simonoff* describe a “skeletal UI,” much less supplementing a “skeletal UI” with icons, labels, or menu items as claimed. The rejection counters, “The GUI objects [of *Simonoff*] themselves are being pushed down from the server to client via GUIScript, thus moving data objects from first memory to second memory is realized.” OA dated 10/18/2004, pp. 11-12. However, the *Simonoff* reference does not describe such GUI objects as being skeletal nor supplementing the same.

Next, independent claims 1, 32, and 36 further recite that the first memory location—which stores the skeletal UI—and the second memory location—which stores icons, labels, or menu items—are both situated on the client device. The cited reference clearly fails to describe

this limitation. Indeed, the rejection concedes that *Simonoff* discloses, “The GUI objects themselves are being pushed down from the server to client via GUIScript, thus moving data objects from first memory to second memory is realized.” *See also*, Col. 9, lines 33-50. The cited reference, which realizes the use of two memory locations only by pushing an entire GUI object “from the server to client,” is quite distinct from the claimed limitation that requires both memory locations to be situated on the client device.

Independent claims 1, 17, 36, and 45 recite populating a native UI control of the client device with source data items that are related to the server-based application and that are transmitted from the UI server to the client device. Similarly, independent claim 32 recites displaying data items, which are related to the server-based application and that are transmitted from the UI server to the client device, in the native UI control. The *Simonoff* reference fails to disclose these limitations. Rather, the cited reference describes loading a GUIScript file that “defines all the display windows and their operation for the application running on the application host 200” and is usable to “display the appropriate GUI to the user.” Col. 9, lines 33-50. There is no description of the GUIScript populating a native UI control as claimed. Instead, the system of *Simonoff* operates by sending messages to the client host 300 that define the GUI in its entirety, not by populating native UI controls. Col. 12, lines 40-45, 49-53. Indeed, the GUIScript that defines the user interface in *Simonoff* contains the totality of the user interface and does not call or populate native UI controls. *See* Col. 13, line 8-Col 14, 56; Figs. 6A-6J, 7, 8A-8C (illustrating entire UI included in GUIScript).

Finally, dependent claims 4 and 20 recite the client device “performing an offline action...while said client device operates in a disconnected mode” and then “subsequently establishing a session between said client device and a UI server; and thereafter transmitting...a command indicative of said offline action” from the client device to the UI server. Nowhere does the *Simonoff* reference disclose this limitation of (1) performing an offline action, (2) subsequently establishing a session between the client and server, and (3) thereafter transmitting to the server a command indicative of the offline action. The only mention the reference makes to offline actions entails a discussion of a client host operating when not connected to a server host. Col. 10, lines 23-30. However, this discussion merely indicates that the client host may

display audio and video clips or timed GUIScripts, “provided that [these items] were available to the...client host 300.” The only description in *Simonoff* of establishing a connection between the client and the server is entirely unrelated to this discussion of displaying audio and video clips, and it fails to describe that such connection is made subsequent to the offline action. Additionally, the description of establishing a client-server connection similarly fails to describe that a command indicative of the offline action is thereafter transmitted to the server action as claimed. *See e.g.*, Col. 9, lines 32-50; Col. 10, lines 34-48 (the portions of the reference cited by Examiner, but which fail to describe establishing a subsequent session or thereafter transmitting a command indicative of the offline action to the server). The cited reference’s discussion of offline operation and establishing a client-server connection are entirely unrelated and fail to anticipate the three distinct steps of claims 4 and 20.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-22, 24-44, 45-47 and 49-53 are in condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 23, and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff et al. U.S. 6,078,322 in view of Dillingham U.S. 6,327,608. Neither *Simonoff* nor *Dillingham*, nor the combination thereof, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 7, 23, or 48. Claims 7, 23, and 48 are allowable as being dependent from claims 1, 17, and 45, respectively, for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff et al. U.S. Patent No. 078,322 in view of Office Notice. Neither *Simonoff* nor the Official Notice, nor the combination thereof, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 13. Claim 13 is allowable as being dependent from claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

This application now stands in allowable form and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Customer Number 25763

Date: March 23, 2005

By: Christopher R. Hilberg
Christopher R. Hilberg, Reg. No. 48,740
Intellectual Property Department
Suite 1500
50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498
(612) 492-6694